

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

WILLIAM GERMANN,

Plaintiff,

v.

SAFECO INSURANCE COMPANY OF
AMERICA,

Defendant.

CASE NO. C21-1434 RSM

MINUTE ORDER

The following MINUTE ORDER is made by direction of the Court, the Honorable Ricardo S. Martinez, Chief United States District Judge:

On March 23, 2022, Defendant's counsel filed what purports to be a Stipulated Protective Order. Dkt. #12. The parties appear to have worked from the Court's Model Stipulated Protective Order but have made numerous changes and have not provided the Court with a redlined version, as required by the Court's local rules. Most notably, the parties have omitted all language converting the parties' stipulation into an order of the Court and have not filed a proposed order or provided an electronic copy to MartinezOrders@wawd.uscourts.gov, as required by the Courts Electronic Filing Procedures. Since March 23, 2022, court staff has reached out to counsel on at least three occasions requesting that an electronic copy of a proposed order be provided. To date, court staff has not received any response.

1 The parties are free to enter stipulations between themselves. But a stipulation between
2 the parties is not binding on this Court or third parties and should not be filed on the Court's
3 docket unless otherwise necessary. The Court's concern is heightened because the parties'
4 stipulation, as drafted, is likely to mislead third parties into believing that the stipulation is an
5 order of the Court.

6 For the reasons identified, the Court STRIKES the Stipulated Protective Order (Dkt. #12)
7 as procedurally improper. The Court requests that the Clerk strike the filing from the record.

8 Counsel is further warned that they may face sanctions if they disseminate copies of their
9 stipulation to third parties.

10 To the extent the parties wish to seek a Court-ordered Protective Order, they may submit
11 a Proposed Stipulated Protective Order in accordance with the applicable rules. The parties are
12 reminded, specifically, that:

13 (1) The party filing a motion must file and serve a proposed order with its motion (*see*
14 W.D. WASH. LOCAL RULES LCR 7(b)(1));

15 (2) The party filing a motion must email an electronic copy of its proposed order to the
16 assigned judge's orders box, in this case: MartinezOrders@wawd.uscourts.gov (*see*
17 W.D. WASH. ELECTRONIC FILING PROCEDURES at 11–12);¹

18 (3) The party filing a motion must appropriately note the motion on the Court's motions
19 calendar (*see* W.D. WASH. LOCAL RULES LCR 7(d));

20 (4) When parties seeking a protective order “wish to depart from the model order[, they]
21 must provide the court with a redlined version identifying departures from the model”
22 (*see* W.D. WASH. LOCAL RULES LCR 26(c)(2)); and
23

24 ¹ Available at: <https://www.wawd.uscourts.gov/sites/wawd/files/ECFFilingProcedures.pdf>

1 (5) The Court expects all counsel to be familiar with its local rules and act in accordance
2 therewith (*see* W.D. WASH. LOCAL RULES LCR 83.3(a)).

3 DATED this 14th day of April, 2022.

4 RAVI SUBRAMANIAN, Clerk

5 By: *s/Serge Bodnarchuk*
6 Deputy Clerk
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24